

102nd District #2 Integrating Committee

December 9, 2005 – 1:30 p.m.

Springfield Township
Allan Paul Room
9150 Winton Road
Cincinnati, OH 45231

Chairman Brayshaw called the 102nd District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting to order at 1:40 p.m.

Board Members Present: Chairman – William Brayshaw, Board Member – Dan Brooks, Board Member – Tom Bryan, Board Member – Eileen Enabnit, Board Member – Richard Huddleston, Board Member – Bill Moller, Board Member – David Savage, Board Member – Scott Stiles and Vice-Chairman – Joseph Sykes

Alternate Members Present: Alternate Member – Ted Hubbard; Alternate Member – Rob Molloy; Alternate Member – Don Rosemeyer; Alternate Member – Stephanie Stoller

Support Staff & Guest Present: Hamilton County – Mr. Joe Cottrill, Pat Ashcraft, John Beck, Eric Beck and Mr. Doug Riddiough; City of Cincinnati – Mr. Greg Long, Mr. Dick Cline, Mr. Richard Szekeresh, Mr. Bill Schefcik, Mr. Joe Vogel, Mr. Steve Bailey, Mr. Steve Niemeier; Greater Cincinnati Water Works – Ms. Becky Calder, Mr. Ken Culpin and Mr. Brian Pickering; Village of Lockland – Mr. David Krings; Lincoln Heights Community Improvement Corporation – Mr. Al Kanthers; Woolpert – Mr. Mike Battles and Mike Elderbrock; City of Loveland – Mr. Chad Ingle; City of Madeira – Mr. Tom Moller; City of Blue Ash – Mr. Richard Dole; City of Mt. Healthy – Mr. Bill Kocher; OPWC – Mr. Mike Miller; Hamilton County Park District – Mr. Jack Sutton; City of North College Hill – Mr. John Knuf; Springfield Township – Mr. Chris Gilbert; Colerain Township – Mr. Tim Lang; CDS – Mr. David Emerick; Citizens for Civic Renewal – Mr. Steve Johns; City of Silverton – Mr. John Smith, Mr. Mark Wendling, Ms. Joyce Glover and Ms. Shirley Hackett

Acknowledgement

Chairman Brayshaw shared that Alternate Member Dave Wagner had recently passed away, acknowledging further all of his good work while serving on the District #2 Integrating Committee, as well as working as a member of the Ohio Public Works Commission and also serving as the Chair for several years.

Approval of Minutes:

Board Member Savage moved for the approval of the minutes from the 101st District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting dated September 9, 2005; seconded by Board Member Huddleston and the motion carried unanimously.

NRAC Committee Report:

- ◇ Mr. Jack Sutton, Chairman of the District #2 NRAC provided a brief update to the Integrating Committee regarding the following items: *(Copy of Report Distributed)*
 - **Current Members Serving on the NRAC Committee:**

Jack Sutton – Hamilton County Park District	Willie Carden, Jr. – Cincinnati Park Board
Holly Utrata-Halcomb – Hamilton County Soil & Water	David Savage – City of Wyoming
Jim Garges – Cincinnati Recreation Commission	Eric Russo – Hillside Trust
Paul Beck – Miami Township	Terry Hankner – Ohio Assoc. of Realtors
Ray Hodges – City of Forest Park	Ken Grob – Hamilton County Farm Bureau
Ron Miller – Hamilton County Regional Planning	
 - Three meetings were held this year, along with the NRAC Annual Meeting held in November 2005.

- ***Current Slate of Elected Officers:***

- Jack Sutton – Chairman
- Holly Utrata-Halcomb – Vice-Chairman
- Jim Garges – Secretary

- ***Major Accomplishments:***

- Revision of the Scoring Criteria & Scoring Methodology
- 4th and Final Round of Funding Unless Reauthorized Next Year
- Funding should be Available in the Spring of 2006
- Scheduled an Application Deadline of Friday, March 31, 2006
- Funding for the District #2 NRAC is Approximately \$2.26 Million Per Round

- Report Summarizing Round #1, Round #2 and Round #3 Projects (*Copy of Report Distributed*)

- ***Overview of the NRAC Program:***

- Three funding rounds represent almost 800 acres of property in Hamilton County that is being protected as green space; much of it being new acquisitions. A portion of it is also restoring or claiming existing properties.

- ◇ Chairman Brayshaw thanked Mr. Sutton and the NRAC Committee for doing an excellent job. Mr. Sutton also shared that the NRAC Committee is very thankful for all the help that Mr. Joe Cottrill, District Liaison Officer has provided to him and to the members of the NRAC.

- **District Liaison Items:**

- ◇ **OPWC History Report:**

- Mr. Joe Cottrill provided a brief report regarding OPWC funding in District #2. The report provides funding data in Hamilton County for Rounds #1-#10 and Rounds #11-#19. (*Copy of Report Distributed*)

- ◇ **Brownfield Clean Ohio Revitalization Program Update:**

- Mr. Cottrill stated the Clean Ohio Council would vote on December 14, 2005, as to which Brownfield projects would be funded by the Clean Ohio Revitalization Program. Mr. Cottrill stated that he would follow up by e-mail to all of the District #2 Integrating Committee members with the final results as to where Hamilton County ranked statewide.

- ◇ **Integrating Committee Regulations:**

- Mr. Cottrill provided the following information with regards to the Ohio Revised Code - Chapter 164:

- 1.) **Make-up of the Integrating Committee**

Due to this being the meeting where funding requests are finalized, there may be those here who are not familiar with the make-up of the Integrating Committee, or its function. As outlined in Chapter 164.04(A)(2) of the Ohio Revised Code, the make-up of the District 2 Integrating Committee is as follows:

“In district two, the district committee shall consist of nine members appointed as follows: two shall be appointed by the board of county commissioners; three shall be appointed by the chief executive officer of the most populous municipal corporation in the district; two shall be appointed by a majority of the other chief executive officers of municipal corporations in the district; and two shall be appointed by a majority of the boards of township trustees in the district”.

It further states that: “The affirmative vote of at least seven members of the committee is required for any action taken by a vote of the committee”.

Also, Chapter 164.04(D) states that: “Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, a county, municipal, or township public official may serve as a member of a district public works integrating committee”.

2.) **Role of the Integrating Committee**

Your role as outlined in Chapter 164.06 of the Ohio Revised Code is to evaluate the applications submitted by governmental jurisdictions for which assistance is sought from the state capital improvements fund, and to select the requests for financial assistance that will be formally submitted by the district to the director of the Ohio Public Works Commission.

District 2 has written a rating methodology for this round of funding, and the Director of the OPWC has approved it, as per the Ohio Revised Code. The Support Staff is presenting to you a funding proposal based on that rating methodology. The Support Staff will present you with a proposed “Priority Listing” of projects, rated from the highest scoring project to the lowest. It will be up to you as a committee to agree on that priority listing order. All of the funding scenarios are based on the proposed priority listing. I would also emphasize that District 2 does not have a rating methodology that allows “discretionary points” to be added to the score of any project submitted for funding.

3.) **Conflict of Interest**

Chapter 164.04(E) states as follows: A member of a district committee does not have an unlawful interest in a public contract under section 2921.42 of the Revised Code solely by virtue of the receipt of financial assistance under this chapter by the local subdivision of which he is also a public official or appointee.

City of Cincinnati Requesting to Address the Integrating Committee

- ◇ Mr. Cottrill informed the Integrating Committee of a letter from the City of Cincinnati requesting to address the Integrating Committee with regards to Round 20 SCIP / LTIP Appeals. *(Copy of Letter Attached)*

Board Member Enabnit stated the City of Cincinnati is willing to waive their request to address the Integrating Committee and to also waive their appeal as submitted. Furthermore, requesting to bring something up to the board for them to think about and to discuss. Stating further that she thought there were some changes in the process that the Support Staff used this round. It was suggested that at a future meeting it would be good to have members of the Support Staff come and talk to the Integrating Committee about what the changes were and how the process went and where they would like to go in the next round. It was felt that it would be good if the members were engaged in these discussions, especially since the Integrating Committee places a great deal of confidence in their recommendations.

Board Member Enabnit stated the City of Cincinnati would be dropping their appeal at this time, expressing that she would like to make this a future agenda item to start having discussions if it is agreeable to everyone else.

Chairman Brayshaw stated it was a good idea to have a briefing by the Support Staff at least annually and prior to the new round of funding. It was felt there had been some tweaking and improvements in the process that not everybody is up to date on.

Board Member Enabnit moved to have an item listed on the agenda for future Integrating Committee meetings in order for the Support Staff to be able to brief the Integrating Committee members about decisions and processes that have taken place prior to the new round of funding; seconded by Chairman Brayshaw and the motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Brayshaw stated that we would need to get some input from the Support Staff as to when this would be appropriate before going too far into Round 21. Mr. Cottrill noted that the Support Staff would probably meet during the end of January or beginning of February 2006.

Board Member Bryan asked if it would be worthwhile if there would be any particular questions entertained by the board to submit them so the Support Staff could have time to review what questions would be out there. Mr. Cottrill suggested that questions be e-mailed to him directly.

Board Member Enabnit asked if there was capacity to have a working session with the Support Staff. Mr. Cottrill relayed that the Support Staff could accommodate this at anytime. Board Member Enabnit stated that something a little more formal where everyone is sitting at the table for discussion.

Board Member Huddleston stated this has been done after the fact, after the Support Staff has summarized everything. The point is well made and if a special meeting is needed earlier in the year that would be fine. Also, with reference to Board Member Bryan's point, that we are not only members of this committee, but members of municipalities and jurisdictions should also submit those questions.

Board Member Enabnit stated that the Integrating Committee as a group kind of have some ownership in the process and feel real comfortable with what is going on while the Support Staff is doing all the hard work.

Board Member Bryan noted the Support Staff made some clarifications last year, just in the rating sheet itself so that we were not flipping from one book to another book to find out if things carried through correctly.

Chairman Brayshaw stated that it is especially important now that we have another ten years to look at, which is to be celebrated as well.

It was further requested of Mr. Cottrill to follow-up with a letter to all the jurisdictions regarding any questions they may have about the District #2 Integrating Committee (i.e., Rating Methodology, Rating Review and procedures of the Support Staff). *(Letter was sent to all Hamilton County Jurisdictions on January 10, 2006)*

Support Staff Items:

♦ Results of Appeals and Final Scores for SCIP/LTIP Projects:

Mr. Cottrill provided the official results of the (18) projects that were appealed. Noting that if an item was appealed there would be a black X or number on the spreadsheet to indicate the new rating. If there is a black X then this was an appeal that was made, but the appeal was denied. Some jurisdictions had more than one appeal. These appeals were reflected within the final scores for both the SCIP/LTIP rating systems. *(Copies of Spreadsheets were Distributed)*

♦ Program Year 2006 - Round 20 Budget and Breakdown:

Mr. Cottrill provided a complete explanation of Program Year 2006 – Round #20 budget breakdown. *(Copies of Handout were Distributed)*

The Support Staff recommended the following items:

- Total funds available for SCIP - \$ 9,989,290
- Total funds available for LTIP - \$ 5,122,474
- Total funds proposed for SCIP - \$11,833,813

- Total funds proposed for LTIP - \$ 6,086,048
- Total SCIP Grants - \$7,719,889
- Total LTIP Grants - \$6,086,048
- Total SCIP Loan/Loan Assistance - \$1,997,800
- Total Revolving Loan Program - \$2,116,124
- Total Loans/Loan Assistance - \$4,113,924
- Total SCIP Available Proposed Remaining Balance: (\$1,844,523)
- Total LTIP Available Proposed Remaining Balance: (\$ 963,574)
- Total Small Government Projects: \$3,786,520

◇ **Recommended Priority Listing (SCIP & LTIP) – Vote Required:**

Mr. Cottrill provided a very thorough explanation and overview of the priority listings for both SCIP and LTIP. It was further explained that the vote would be taken on the priority order of projects #1 through #66. *(Copies of Spreadsheets were Distributed)*

After further discussion, the following motion was made:

Board Member Savage moved adoption of the priority listings as presented by the Support Staff for both SCIP & LTIP projects (Projects #1 - #66) for the District #2 Integrating Committee for Round #20; seconded by Board Member Brooks and the motion carried unanimously.

◇ **Recommended Grant Projects (SCIP & LTIP) – Vote Required:**

Mr. Cottrill provided a very thorough explanation and overview of the recommended grant projects for both SCIP and LTIP. It was further explained that the vote would be taken on the priority of projects #1 through #12 for SCIP and the priority of projects #1 through #5 for LTIP. *(Copies of Spreadsheets were Distributed)*

After further discussion, the following motion was made:

Board Member Brooks moved adoption of the SCIP & LTIP Grant Projects as presented by the Support Staff for the District #2 Integrating Committee for Round #20; seconded by Board Member Savage and the motion carried unanimously.

◇ **Recommended Loan Projects (SCIP Allocation & Revolving Loan Program) – Vote Required:**

Mr. Cottrill provided the recommended SCIP Allocation Loan and Revolving Loan Program Projects. Noting the previously approved priority for projects #26, #31 #41 for the SCIP Allocation and projects #15 and #44 under the Revolving Loan Program. It was further noted that a correction should be made to the spreadsheet entitled “SCIP Allocation Loan Project” under Project #31 for the City of Cincinnati (CWW R20-001-5B - Countywide Water Main Improvements) there is no interest rate for term and the field should be left blank. *(Copies of Spreadsheets were Distributed)*

Board Member Huddleston moved adoption of the SCIP Allocation Projects and the Revolving Loan Projects as presented by the Support Staff for the District #2 Integrating Committee for Round #20; seconded by Board Member Sykes and the motion carried unanimously.

Board Member Savage noted the District #2 Integrating Committee had approved 22 projects in total for various kinds of funding. Of those 22 projects, 16 of them represent different jurisdictions. Noting further that the District #2 Integrating Committee had a long-term goal of striving for a system that would make sure that each jurisdiction that had a true need would have a reasonable opportunity to compete for these funds.

Board Member Brooks referenced the informative twenty-year past history report provided by the Support Staff and complimented them, as well as the District #2 Integrating Committee for all their hard work over the years. Further noting \$321 million dollars total funding. Stating that he would like to know if these projects have other benefits to their communities that have been effective. Inquiring further to find out a quantitative check to see that if in a main corridor, has it improved the economic welfare of the community and has it improved the housing stock? What other benefits have resulted from this funding? It was felt there is more to building great roads, sewers and sidewalks and \$321 million dollars of infrastructure.

Board Member Savage stated there is an Urban Design program at the University of Cincinnati, noting this as an excellent research project.

Board Member Huddleston also stated this information would be interesting if taken to the legislature with other types of programs that could be funded in a similar manner. You could then get the spin off of whether it is housing or urban center renewals for the various jurisdictions.

After further discussion, Mr. Cottrill stated that he would see what the Support Staff could come up with.

◊ **Useful Life Update:**

Mr. Cottrill provided an informational overview of the Useful Life for the SCIP, LTIP and RLP programs. *(Copies of Spreadsheets were Distributed)*

Mr. Cottrill noted the SCIP projects along with the assistance of the allocation loans, has a useful life of a little over twenty-seven years. The minimum is twenty-years. The LTIP projects have a useful life of a little over twenty-three years. The RLP, which must have it's own separate useful life has a useful life of approximately thirty-seven years.

Chairman Brayshaw shared the following comments, noting that the coordination of utility cuts with the OPWC projects need to be emphasized to a greater degree. Stating further that he personally hates to sign a document that says it has a useful life of twenty-years and then three years later a MSD project comes in that wants an open cut twenty feet deep through the road. This will interfere with traffic again, with the businesses again and also with Safety Services again. There is the need to have an in depth review of MSD's capital improvement program with respect to underground utilities that are proposed to be improved in the foreseeable future, within at least twenty-years. Then to look at alternatives of not going through the pavement if they can't get it done within the timeframe of the OPWC projects so they can be done concurrent. Looking at the next ten years this coordination work should be emphasized between the utilities as well as anything where there is going to be open cuts in the right-of-way needed. It was strongly suggested that this should be a future goal of the District #2 Integrating Committee.

Board Member Bryan stated this should be addressed with MSD and the CWW, noting the need to have a twenty-year projection. This is not only directly affecting the projects; it is also a perceptual thing with the taxpayers.

Board Member Moller stated from the City of Cincinnati's perspective, they see project lists or capital budgets that come in from MSD and CWW in July for the next two years. By the time the budgets are actually approved, there are changes between summer and fall based on their ability to get other funding and on other priorities. One of the biggest problems is that it is the constant change and it is very difficult to coordinate all that goes on. Both MSD and CWW have multi-year capital plans that should be shared with the Hamilton County Engineer's Office, at least for those projects that are anticipated in Hamilton County, if not in other jurisdictions. The list would change, but at least you would be made aware of the lists.

Board Member Stiles also added that he had just sat in on a series of presentations by all of the divisions of MSD and one of their Division Superintendents mentioned the exact points noted in discussion here today. Specifically internally with the City of Cincinnati, in terms of coordinating with other departments, they spoke about the Department of Transportation & Engineering and CWW.

Chairman Brayshaw stated there is a need for advanced planning coordination. As the problem with OPWC projects is that we don't know until a meeting like this what is going to get funded. So we don't realize in advance what projects will get funded. At this point in time, now that we have voted, we should definitely circulate and coordinate again, so that the utilities know what the Integrating Committee approved and about what timeframe construction is anticipated.

Board Member Bryan stated that rather than all of the different municipalities and townships that are chasing after Cinergy, MSD and CWW, it was suggested to have the Hamilton County Engineer's Office serve as a clearinghouse for those projects. He noted that not only do the townships have township roads; they have county roads that crisscross throughout townships and cities.

Chairman Brayshaw stated, as County Engineer for all of the Townships, this could be done, but all the other municipalities may not agree. Most of this coordination would have to come from MSD, CWW and the City of Cincinnati Engineering Department. The only others would be if they have independent waterworks such as the City of Wyoming, City of Loveland and City of Harrison. As an example, the County Engineer's Office has been working very closely with Harrison Township and the City of Harrison with the Dry Fork Road project. But this type of work needs to be done across the board. It was also noted that in the past there were utility coordination meetings and then the utilities stopped attending. Now Cinergy wants to be reimbursed for everything that is moved, even though it was in county right-of-way.

◇ **Recommended Small Government Projects – Vote Required:**

Mr. Cottrill provided an informational overview of the (5) recommended Small Governments Projects. *(Copies of Spreadsheets were Distributed)*

Board Member Bryan moved adoption of the top (5) Small Government Projects priority listing as presented to the Board for the District #2 Integrating Committee for Round #20; seconded by Board Member Stiles and the motion carried unanimously.

◇ **Recommended District Administrative Costs Program for 2006 – Vote Required:**

Mr. Cottrill provided an informational overview of the recommended District Administrative Costs Program for 2006. *(Copies of Handout were Distributed)*

Board Member Moller moved adoption of the recommended District Administrative Costs for the total amount of Forty Thousand Dollars for Program Year 2006 for the District #2 Integrating Committee; seconded by Board Member Sykes and the motion carried unanimously.

Board Member Moller thanked the District #2 Integrating Committee Support Staff and Mr. Cottrill for all their hard work over the past twenty years.

Small Government Sub-Committee:

- ◇ Board Member Bryan announced that the Small Government Sub-Committee would be meeting in May of 2006.

Old Business:

- ◇ Mr. Mike Miller, OPWC Representative, provided a brief update regarding Issue One:

The Senate introduced Senate Bill 263 last Friday. There were hearings and they voted the bill out of committee on Tuesday. It was then voted out of the whole Senate unanimously on Wednesday. It is believed that the House has the intention of picking that bill up and have hearings and vote it out of committee early next week and then vote it out of the whole house mid next week. The bills bonds are by Senator John Kerry, who has the implementing language for the Third Frontier Program as well as the Job Ready Site Development Program. The current language that passed out of the Senate follows the Brownfield Revitalization Program delivery model. It will be asking the (19) District Integrating Committee's to accept applications and prioritize them locally and forward three applications to the Ohio Department of Development where they will be in a statewide competition. Then the final project selection process will take place at the Ohio Department of Development. They are looking to rely on the District Integrating Committee's similar to the Brownfield Revitalization Program to get some local prioritization and flavor into that project selection process.

In addition, the newly enacted section constitution (2P) allows for bonds to be issued once per fiscal year under that program for calendar 2006. Their intention is to touch two fiscal years for two \$30 million dollar funding rounds in calendar year 2006. Noting that if anyone has projects they think may fit into that program it was suggested to look at the implementing legislation.

Chairman Brayshaw thanked Mr. Miller for the update.

New Business:

- ◇ Mr. Cottrill announced that all District #2 Integrating Committee Board Members and Alternate Members must be reappointed or replaced by May 2006. Letters of appointment from the appropriate jurisdiction / organization are due to the District Liaison prior to Monday, May 1, 2006. These appointments are done every three years.

Next Meeting Date:

- ◇ Next District #2 Integrating Committee meeting date is to be determined. It was further noted that a letter would be submitted to all committee members and jurisdictions inviting them to submit questions for the Support Staff. Once this information is compiled a meeting date will be determined.
- ◇ Board Member Savage shared that a future meeting might also be needed in order to follow-up on the new legislative and Brownfield information as reported earlier.

Adjournment:

Board Member Savaged move to adjourn the 102nd District #2 Integrating Committee meeting; seconded by Board Member Bryan and the meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy Listermann

Cathy Listermann
Recording Secretary

DISTRICT 2 BREAKDOWN - PY 2006 - ROUND 20

FUNDS AVAILABLE

	<u>SCIP</u>	<u>LTIP</u>
DISTRICT GRANT ALLOCATION	\$6,196,000.00	\$5,089,000.00
EXISTING BALANCE	\$371,434.00	\$33,474.00
MAXIMUM TOTAL GRANTS =	\$6,567,434.00	\$5,122,474.00
REGULAR ALLOCATION LOANS	\$1,549,000.00	
ADDITIONAL ALLOCATION LOANS	\$0.00	
MINIMUM TOTAL LOANS =	\$1,549,000.00	
REVOLVING LOAN PROGRAM	\$1,539,000.00	
ADDITIONAL RLP FUNDS	\$333,856.00	
TOTAL RLP FUNDS =	\$1,872,856.00	
TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE =	\$9,989,290.00	\$5,122,474.00

FUNDS PROPOSED

	<u>SCIP</u>	<u>LTIP</u>
PROPOSED GRANT TOTALS	\$7,719,889.00	\$6,086,048.00
SCIP LOAN / LOAN ASSISTANCE TOTAL	\$1,997,800.00	\$0.00
RLP LOAN TOTAL	\$2,116,124.00	\$0.00
PROPOSED TOTALS	\$11,833,813.00	\$6,086,048.00
AVAILABLE	\$9,989,290.00	\$5,122,474.00
PROPOSED	\$11,833,813.00	\$6,086,048.00
REMAINING BALANCE	(\$1,844,523.00)	(\$963,574.00)

PROGRAM YEAR 2006 PROJECTS

SCIP GRANT PROJECTS

PROJECT CODE	\$ REQUEST	PROJ. NO.	TYPE	RECOMMEND	COMMENTS
D2IC-R20-002-00	\$28,000.00		GRANT	SCIP	DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS
CMB R20-001-2A	\$425,000.00	1	GRANT	SCIP	
DEL R20-001-2C	\$400,000.00	2	GRANT	SCIP	
NOR R20-001-2C	\$1,320,000.00	3	GRANT	SCIP	
CHE R20-002-2A	\$218,400.00	4	GRANT	SCIP	
CIN R20-002-2A	\$750,000.00	5	GRANT	SCIP	
NCH R20-001-2C	\$480,000.00	6	GRANT	SCIP	
SPR R20-001-2B	\$367,600.00	7	GRANT	SCIP	
COL R20-001-2C, 1A	\$828,000.00	8	GRANT	SCIP	
GRN R20-002-2A	\$152,020.00	9	GRANT	SCIP	
STB R20-001-2B	\$600,000.00	10	GRANT	SCIP	
CIN R20-001-2A	\$840,000.00	11	GRANT	SCIP	PARTIALLY FUNDED
GLE R20-001-1B	\$257,600.00	12	CONTINGENCY	SCIP	
LOV R20-001-2C	\$363,429.00	13	CONTINGENCY	SCIP	
NBD R20-001-2C	\$129,840.00	14	CONTINGENCY	SCIP	
NCH R20-003-2C	\$560,000.00	15	CONTINGENCY	SCIP	
SCIP GRANT TOTAL =	\$7,719,889.00				
SCIP LOAN/LOAN ASSISTANCE TOTAL =	\$1,997,800.00				
TOTAL SCIP RECOMMENDATIONS =	\$9,717,689.00	=	125.4705%	OF ALLOCATION	(MINIMUM = 115%)

SCIP ALLOCATION LOANS / LOAN ASSISTANCE

PROJECT CODE	\$ REQUEST	PROJ. NO.	PROJECT TYPE	RECOMMEND	INTEREST RATE	TERM YEARS
SIL R20-001-2A	\$525,000.00	26	LOAN	SCIP	0%	20
CWW R20-01-5B	\$950,000.00	31	LOAN ASSISTANCE	SCIP	N/A	N/A
LOV R20-003-5B	\$522,800.00	41	LOAN	SCIP	0%	20
SCIP LOAN / L.A. TOTAL (ALLOCATION) =	\$1,997,800.00	=	25.7947%	OF ALLOCATION	(MINIMUM = 20%)	

REVOLVING LOAN PROGRAM

PROJECT CODE	\$ REQUEST	PROJ. NO.	PROJECT TYPE	RECOMMEND	INTEREST RATE	TERM YEARS
HAM R20-002-2A	\$1,552,500.00	15	LOAN	RLP	0%	20
MSD R20-01-4A	\$563,624.00	44	LOAN	RLP	0%	20
REVOLVING LOAN PROGRAM TOTAL=	\$2,116,124.00					
TOTAL ALL LOANS/LOAN ASSISTANCE =	\$4,113,924.00					

LTIP GRANT PROJECTS

PROJECT CODE	\$ REQUEST	PROJ. NO.	TYPE	RECOMMEND	COMMENTS
D2IC-R20-002-00	\$12,000.00		GRANT	LTIP	DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS
FAX R20-001-2D	\$1,802,150.00	1	GRANT	LTIP	2nd HALF OF FUNDS
GRN R20-001-2D	\$1,151,228.00	2	GRANT	LTIP	SAME AMOUNT IN ROUND 21
HAM R20-001-2A	\$876,000.00	3	GRANT	LTIP	SAME AMOUNT IN ROUND 21
SHA R20-001-2D	\$814,670.00	4	GRANT	LTIP	
CIN R20-003-2A	\$590,000.00	5	GRANT	LTIP	PARTIALLY FUNDED
CIN R20-001-2A	\$840,000.00	6	CONTINGENCY	LTIP	
LTIP GRANT TOTAL =	\$6,086,048.00	=	119.5922%	OF ALLOCATION	(MINIMUM = 115%)

SMALL GOVERNMENT PROJECTS

PROJECT CODE	\$ REQUEST	PROJ. NO.	TYPE	ORDER RECOMMENDED	COMMENTS
GLE R20-001-1B	\$257,600.00	13	SMALL GOVERNMENT	1	5 ADDITIONAL POINTS
NBD R20-001-2C	\$129,840.00	16	SMALL GOVERNMENT	2	4 ADDITIONAL POINTS
LOC R20-001-2A	\$495,000.00	32	SMALL GOVERNMENT	3	3 ADDITIONAL POINTS
NEW R20-001-2A	\$224,000.00	48	SMALL GOVERNMENT	4	2 ADDITIONAL POINTS
ADD R20-001-22A	\$452,900.00	38	SMALL GOVERNMENT	5	1 ADDITIONAL POINT
MAR R20-001-2,3A	\$345,000.00	55	SMALL GOVERNMENT	6	
CLE R20-001-2D	\$900,000.00	51	SMALL GOVERNMENT	7	
NBD R20-002-2A	\$172,000.00	60	SMALL GOVERNMENT	8	
WDL R20-001-2D	\$492,000.00	47	SMALL GOVERNMENT	9	
GLE R20-002-2A	\$318,180.00	39	SMALL GOVERNMENT	10	
TOTAL SMALL GOVERNMENT REQUEST =	\$3,786,520.00				

(MAXIMUM OF 10 APPLICATIONS MAY BE SUBMITTED TO THE SMALL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION)

102nd District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting
Springfield Township Building
9150 Winton Road
Cincinnati, OH 45231
December 9, 2005 – 1:30 pm

AGENDA

- 1.) Meeting Called to Order – Chairman Brayshaw
- 2.) Approval of 101st Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes from September 9, 2005
- 3.) Report of the NRAC Committee – Mr. Jack Sutton, Chairman
- 4.) District Liaison Items:
 - (A) Report of the history of OPWC funding in District #2
 - (B) Brownfield project update
 - (C) Integrating Committee regulations
- 5.) Request from the City of Cincinnati to address the Integrating Committee
- 6.) Support Staff Items:
 - (A) Results of appeals and final scores for SCIP/LTIP projects.
 - (B) Round 20 budget and breakdown.
 - (C) Recommended Priority Listing of all applications received (SCIP & LTIP). *(Vote Required)***
 - (D) Recommended Grant Projects (SCIP & LTIP). *(Vote Required)***
 - (E) Recommended Loan projects (SCIP Allocation, RLP) and Term/Interest rate recommendations. *(Vote Required)***
 - (F) Recommended Small Government Projects for Round 20. *(Vote Required)***
 - (G) Recommended District Administrative Costs Program for 2006. *(Vote Required)***
- 7.) Small Governments Sub-Committee:

The Small Government Commission will hold a vote on the submitted projects in May 2006. The District Liaison will be in attendance at the meeting.
- 8.) Old Business:
- 9.) New Business:

All District #2 Integrating Committee Board Members and Alternate Members must be either re-appointed or replaced by May 2006. Letters of appointment from the appropriate jurisdiction / organization are due to the District Liaison prior to Monday, May 1, 2006.
- 10.) Next Meeting Date: To be Determined
- 11.) Meeting Adjourn

*****Note: Seven (7) affirmative votes are required to approve any item on the agenda.***

102nd District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting

Springfield Township Building
Allen Paul Room
9150 Winton Road
Cincinnati, OH 45231

1:30 p.m.

December 9, 2005

BOARD ATTENDANCE LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
<u>JOE COTTRILL</u>	<u>HAM. CO. ENGR'S</u>	<u>946-8906</u>
<u>PAT ASHCRAFT</u>	<u>HOM. CO. ENGR'S</u>	<u>946-8430</u>
<u>JOHN BECK</u>	<u>HOM. CO. ENGR'S</u>	<u>946-4267</u>
<u>ERIC BECK</u>	<u>HOM. CO. ENGR'S</u>	<u>946-8430</u>
<u>GREG LONG</u>	<u>CITY OF CINCINNATI</u>	<u>352-5289</u>
<u>Cathy Listermann</u>	<u>HCE</u>	<u>946-8902</u>
<u>DICK CLINE</u>	<u>CITY OF CINTI</u>	<u>352-6735</u>
<u>Mike Battles</u>	<u>Woolpert</u>	<u>272-8300</u>
<u>Chad Ingle</u>	<u>City of Loveland</u>	<u>683-0150</u>
<u>Wm. Brayshaw</u>	<u>HCE</u>	<u>946-8902</u>
<u>DAVE KIRKING</u>	<u>LOCKCANN</u>	<u>761 1124</u>
<u>TOM MOELLER</u>	<u>MADEIRA</u>	<u>561-7228</u>

102nd District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting

Springfield Township Building
Allen Paul Room
9150 Winton Road
Cincinnati, OH 45231

1:30 p.m.

December 9, 2005

VISITOR LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Richard Dole	City of Blue Ash	745-8526
Deed Stubbard	Ham. W. Eng's Off.	946-8903
Bill Kocher	Mt. Healthy	931-8840
Richard Szekeres	City of Cincinnati	352-3919
Bill Shefcik	" "	352 5273
Joe Vogel	" "	352/518
Don Rosemeyer	" "	
Mike Miller	OPWC	614 752-9343
Mike Ellerbrock	Woolpert	513-272-8300
Jack Sutton	NRAC	521-7275
John Knuf	NCH	521-7413
Ron MacLay	Sy.C. Twp.	791-8447

102nd District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting

Springfield Township Building
Allen Paul Room
9150 Winton Road
Cincinnati, OH 45231

1:30 p.m.

December 9, 2005

VISITOR LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Fileen Enabun.7	Cincinnati	352-6232
Becky Calder	Water Works	591-7857
Ken Culpin	GC WW	591-7846
Brian Pickering	"	591-6856
Steve Bailey	Cincinnati/DOTE	352-1925
Steve Niemeler	" "	352-3738
Bill Mullen	Cincinnati	352-6275
Scott Sato	"	352-3475
DAVID ENKMAN	CDS	791-1700
CHRIS GILBERT	Springfield Twp	522-1410
Tom Bryan	"	522-1410
Davis Savage	HCMC (Wyoming)	821-7600

[illegible]

102nd District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting

Springfield Township Building
Allen Paul Room
9150 Winton Road
Cincinnati, OH 45231

1:30 p.m.

December 9, 2005

VISITOR LIST

NAME

AFFILIATION

PHONE

Joe Sykes

HAM Co Twp

513 941 3393

Al Karter

Lincoln Heights CFC

769-5465

Mark Wendley

Silverton

938-6240

Sherkey Hackett

Council-Silverton

984-6736

Joe B. Glover

Silverton Council

793-4588

John A. Smith

MAYOR City
of Silverton

891-0955